USDOE FEED MATERIALS PRODUCTION CENTER HAMILTON COUNTY SOLID & HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT G-TSDF OH689008976

08/19/87

OEPA/DOE-FO 7 LETTER



State of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

Southwest District Office 7 East Fourth Street Dayton, Ohio 45402-2086 (513) 449-6357



Richard F. Celeste Governor

2636

August 19, 1987

Re: USDOE FEED MATERIALS PRODUCTION CENTER HAMILTON COUNTY
SOLID & HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT
G-TSDF 0H689008976

Mr. James A. Reafsnyder-Site Manager Department of Energy P.O. Box 398705 Cincinnati, OH 45239

Dear Mr. Reafsnyder:

On August 19, 1987, Rich Bendula, a geologist of our office, reviewed the groundwater monitoring section to complete the TSD inspection for Feed Materials Production Center. It appears as though you are in compliance with Óhio's Hazardous Waste Rules for groundwater monitoring under OAC 3745-65-90 thru 94, and USEPA's Hazardous Waste Regulations for groundwater monitoring under 40 CFR 267.50 thru 267.53. The completed inspection form for this section is enclosed.

If you have any questions regarding this section of the inspection contact me or Rich Bendula at (513) 449-6357.

Sincerely,

Scott R. Shave Scott R. Shane

Solid & Hazardous Waste Management

SRS/1a1

cc: Dave Sholtis - OEPA/CO

Dan Watson - USEPA, Cleveland Katherine McCord - USEPA, Chicago

## RCRA INTERIM STATUS INSPECTION FORM

ග ෆ		SUBPART F: GROUNDWATER MOI	NITORING				
Type of f	acility: (check appropriately)			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Walved</u>
b) 1	urface impoundment andfill and treatment facility			<u> </u>	<u>/</u> <u> </u>		
M Fi	NDER INTERIM STATUS STANDARDS A W/ DNITORING REQUIREMENTS. PLEASE NO ROM A WASTE PILE IS LEFT IN PLACE LANDFILL" AND MUST MEET POST-CLOSU	OTE, HOWEVER, THAT IF ANY HA AT CLOSURE, THE "WASTE PILE	AZARDOUS WASTE E" BECOMES A				
Groundwate	er Monitoring Program	•					
1. Was th	he groundwater monitoring program o",	reviewed prior to site vis	it?	<u> </u>	· .		
a) W	as the groundwater program reviewent ite inspection?	ed at the facility prior to	·	✓ .	. <u></u>		
facili aquif	groundwater monitoring program (dity's impact on the quality of grower underlying the facility) been followed [3745-65-90(A)]	oundwater in the uppermost			<u>~</u>	Upperma aguiter comple monit	not not ored
aquif	t least one monitoring well been for hydraulically upgradient from tement area? 265.91(a)(1) [3745-6	the limit of the waste	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>		— .	
a) Ai	re groundwater samples from the up	ppermost aquifer, representa	itive			Upq radic	at well

of background groundwater quality and not affected by the facility

(as ensured by proper well number, location and depths)?

<b>10</b> .		<u>Yes</u>	No	<u>Unknown</u> <u>Walved</u>
m 19 1/4.	Have at least three monitoring wells been installed hydraulically downgradient at the limit of the waste handling or management area? 265.91(a)(2) [3745-65-91(A)(2)]	<u> </u>		<b>ෆ</b>
·	a) Do well number, locations and depths ensure prompt detection of any statistically significant amounts of hazardous waste or hazardous waste constituents that migrate from the waste management area to the uppermost aquifer?		<u> </u>	Need additional cluster wells which are properly constructed to monitor upper
5.	Have the locations of the waste management areas been verified to conform with information in the groundwater program?		-	
	a) If the facility contains multiple waste management components, is each component adequately monitored?	N/A		
6.	Do the numbers, locations, and depths of the groundwater monitoring wells agree with the data in the groundwater monitoring system program? If "No", explain discrepancies.	<u> </u>	· 	
~. <b>7.</b>	Well completion details. 265.91(c) [3745-65-91(C)]	•	<b>.</b>	
	a) Are wells properly cased?	<u> </u>		
	b) Are wells screened (perforated) and packed where necessary to enable sampling at appropriate depths?	<u> </u>		secconner
	c) Are annular spaces properly sealed to prevent contamination of groundwater?			·

كمعمولا	للموا		<u>Yes</u>	. <u>No</u>	<u>Unknown</u> <u>Walved</u>
34.8.		a groundwater sampling and analysis plan been developed? 5.92(a) [3745-65-92(A)]	· <u>/</u>		
හ ග	a)	Has it been followed?	$\checkmark$		
ල දැ	b)	Is the plan kept at the facility?	<u> </u>		
	c)	Does the plan include procedures and techniques for:			
		1) Sample collection?	<u> </u>		
		2) Sample preservation?	<u> </u>		
		3) Sample shipment?	<u> </u>		•
		4) Analytical procedures?	<u> </u>		
	÷	5) Chain of custody control?			
9.	qua	the required parameters in groundwater samples being tested arterly for the first year? 265.92(b) [3745-65-92(B)] 1 265.92(c)(1) [3745-65-92(C)]	<u> </u>		missed 2 nd quart sampling but made up missed event
9.	qua	the required parameters in groundwater samples being tested arterly for the first year? 265.92(b) [3745-65-92(B)]	<u> </u>		sapling but made
9.	qua and	the required parameters in groundwater samples being tested arterly for the first year? 265.92(b) [3745-65-92(B)] 1 265.92(c)(1) [3745-65-92(C)]	<u> </u>		sapling but made
9.	qua and	the required parameters in groundwater samples being tested arterly for the first year? 265.92(b) [3745-65-92(B)] 1 265.92(c)(1) [3745-65-92(C)]  Are the groundwater samples analyzed for the following:  1) Parameters characterizing the suitability of the groundwater	✓ ✓ <u>✓</u>		sapling but made
9.	qua and	the required parameters in groundwater samples being tested arterly for the first year? 265.92(b) [3745-65-92(B)] 265.92(c)(1) [3745-65-92(C)]  Are the groundwater samples analyzed for the following:  1) Parameters characterizing the suitability of the groundwater as a drinking water supply? 265.92(b)(1) [3745-65-92(B)(1)]  2) Parameters establishing groundwater quality?	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	——————————————————————————————————————	sapling but made

හ දැ		(11)	Are provisions made to calculate the initial background arithmetic mean and variance of the respective parameter	163	<u>NO</u>	LO CO
			concentrations or values obtained from the upgradient well(s) during the first year? 265.92(c)(2) [3745-65-92(C)(2)]		$\checkmark$	
	b)		lities which have completed first year groundwater sampling lysis requirements:	·		Just begining 2nd year of sampling If sampling plan
			e samples been obtained and analyzed for the groundwater ity parameters at least annually? 265.92(d)(l) [3745-65-92(D)(l)]	10/#	_	is followed, then these treme will
	-	grou	e samples been obtained and analyzed for the indicators of undwater contamination at least semi-annually?	٢/٨		be checked yes
	<b>c)</b>		oundwater surface elevations determined at each monitoring the time a sample was taken? 265.92(e) [3745-65-92(E)]	` <i>\</i> /^	·	
<del></del>	d)		oundwater surface elevations evaluated annually to determine whether itoring wells are properly placed? 265.92(f) [3745-65-92(E)]	· \/	^ <u></u>	: وبعد ( مستند به مقدم ) ( مس <u>د مد تدر ) ( م</u>
	e)	of month	as determined that-modification of the number, location or depth toring wells was necessary, was the system brought into compliance 5.91(a) [3745-65-91(A)]? 265.93(f) [3745-65-93(F)]	_ ~	/a	
10.			Ine of a groundwater quality assessment program been 265.93(a) [3745-65-93(A)]		<u>~</u>	
	a)	Does 1t	describe a program capable of determining:			
		•	ther hazardous waste or hazardous waste constituents have ered the groundwater?	-	<u>~</u>	
			rate and extent of migration of hazardous waste or ardous waste constituents in groundwater?		<u>~</u>	
		•	centrations of hazardous waste or hazardous waste stituents in groundwater?		_	

(S)	•	•	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	Unknown	<u>Walved</u>
.V	b) After the first year of monitoring measurements of each indicator par- taken for each well? 265.93(b) [	ameter been obtained for samples	N/A	·	See comm	196 . 196
	1) Were the results compared with from the upgradient well(s) de	the initial background means termined during the first year?		<u> </u>		
	(i) Was each well considered	individually?		<u>/</u>	•	
	(11) Was the Student's t-test	used (at the 0.01 level of significance?)				
	2) Was a significant increase (or	pH decrease as well) found in the:	,			
	(1) Upgradient wells (If "Ye must also be completed.)					
	(11) Downgradient wells		W/A	r		
.11.	I. Have records been kept of analyses for and (d) [3745-65-92(C) and (D)? 265.9		<u> </u>			
12.	<ol> <li>Have records been kept of groundwater time of sampling for each well? 265.9</li> </ol>		<u>'\</u>			
	from the wells where a significant dif is confirmed, the Director should be n	n, split, and analyze additional samples ference was detected. If the difference otified in writing within 7 days and a days. [3735-65-93(C)(2) and (D)(2)(3)]				
13.	3. Have records been kept of required ele 265.94(a)(1) [3745-65-94(A)(1)]	vations in 265.93(b) [3745-65-93(B)]?	<u> </u>	_		
14.	4. Have the following been submitted to t 265.94(a)(2) [3745-65-94(A)(2)]	he Regional Administrator:				
	a) Initial background concentrations [3745-65-92(B)] within 15 days aft required during the first year?	of parameters listed in 265.92(b) er completing each quarterly analysis	<u> </u>			

5 7		·	<u>Yes</u>	No .	<u>Unknown</u>	Waived
_{φ). (φ).	For each well, have any paramete have exceeded the maximum contam water supplied been separately in		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>		<b>1</b>
c)	Annual reports including: [3745	-65-94(A)(2)]				
		parameters used as indicators of reach well along with required [3745-65-93(B)]?	. <del></del>	<u> </u>		
	2) Any significant differences in upgradient wells separate	from initial background values ly identified?		·		
	3) Results of the evaluation of	groundwater surface elevations?	<u> </u>			
		Comments: Subpart F	,			